

REMARKS

Applicants' invention as presently claimed provides both of the flexible conductive wires and the metallic plate member as connected to the counterpart connector together when the fitting portion is connected with the counterpart connector.

The title has been changed to "Flexible Transmission Link Having Integral Connectors" as required by the Examiner.

With respect to the differences of the present invention from the cited referenced Masumoto et al., our comments will be described below. When the fitting portion is connected with the counterpart connector, the end portions and the contact portion are brought into contact with contacts of the counterpart connector. This means that the flexible conductive wires and the metallic plate member are connected to the counterpart connector together. Accordingly, it is possible to use the flexible conductive wires as signal contacts and to use the metallic plate member as a ground contact. The second engaging portion is engaged with the first engaging portion to integrate the insulator with the flexible reinforcing member.

As regards the amended claim 1, please note that the flexible connector has unique structures in that:

the insulating sheet (5) is placed between each of the flexible conductive wires (31) and the flexible reinforcing member (6);

when the fitting portion (82) is connected with the counterpart connector (11), the end portions of the flexible conductive wires are brought into contact with the signal contacts (13) of the counterpart connector while the contact portion of the flexible reinforcing metallic plate member is brought into contact with the ground contact of the counterpart connector; and

the second engaging portion is engaged with the first engaging portion to integrate the insulator with the flexible reinforcing member.

On the other hand, Masumoto et al. Does not show the above-mentioned unique structures at all.

We therefore believe that claim 1 is not anticipated by Masumoto et al. and is allowable. In addition, the other claims should be allowed because they are dependent on the amended claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, it is thought that the application is now in condition for

allowance. Claim 1, as amended, recites over the prior art. Upon entry of the instant amendment dependent claims 4 - 12 are also believed patentable in view of the foregoing. If the Examiner disagrees, he is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney before issuing a new Office Action.

Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-19-03

Perry J. Hoffman

Perry J. Hoffman, Reg. 37,150

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLC
401 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Telephone 312.222.6636
Fax 312.222.0818

Slclient\200380\0290\IC0285931.2